

We know about testing standards where we are going to have tests that are similar enough from one State to another to be able to compare the performance of States, schools within States and performance of States with each other, and have some idea of what is happening in America overall with respect to adequate and excellent education. What the set of standards that we have not agreed on, we did agree on, and it was reversed. And the great horror story of the 104th Congress, they turned around everything except one, in one area they went backwards at a rapid rate.

We had opportunity-to-learn standards written into the legislation. The Goals 2000 Educate America Act had three sets of standards. They are the curriculum standards. They had the testing standards. And through a long debate, we members of the Education Committee had gotten the opportunity-to-learn standards.

Opportunity-to-learn standards are exactly what they say. If you are going to have a curriculum that is a great curriculum, if you are going to have testing, you are testing the children to see if they measure up and can learn that curriculum, one thing else has to happen. You have to have a guarantee that the students have an opportunity to learn by seeing to it that they have the right books so that they can measure up to the standards, pass tests, guarantee that they have a safe place to study, a safe place to learn.

That is part of the opportunity to learn. Guarantee that they have qualified teachers, people who know what they are doing. At one point we had a survey in New York City and found that two-thirds of the teachers who were teaching math and science in public schools in New York City had not majored in math and science in college. In junior high school, if you have teachers teaching math and science who did not major in science in college, you have a problem. Opportunity-to-learn standards would say that the standard is that no State, no locality should permit a situation where children do not have an opportunity to learn because the teachers are not qualified.

Opportunity to learn means that, if you are going to teach science, the school ought to have a science laboratory. It means that the science laboratory ought to have adequate supplies. Opportunity to learn means that you have books in the library which enhance the textbooks which are not 30 years old.

We have a problem with history books, social studies books being 30 years old in some of the libraries in New York City. So opportunity to learn and the agreement to accept opportunity-to-learn standards is one of those barometers by which we can measure whether people are sincere about improving education in America. One of those barometers to flesh out the Trojan horses and the underground

operatives and the people trying to ambush the effort is to ask them, how do you feel about opportunity to learn?

One of the first tests of opportunity-to-learn standards is, will you support the President's construction initiatives because at least every child should be in a building that is safe, in a building that is warm. In a building that does not burn coal and put pollutants in the air for children to breathe to get contaminated with all kinds of harmful substances. A building that is safe, a building that has decent lighting, a building that has decent ventilation, a building that is adequate so that you do not have what is happening in New York City. Again, schools will tell you because the board of education and the bureaucrats have told them that they do not have an overcrowding problem. We had a little test, the Central Brooklyn Martin Luther King Commission, which is my advisory committee on education, they sent people to school to see if they have solved their overcrowding problem.

Principals said, we have no problem, slightly over capacity. They were lying. The next question I told them to ask was, how many lunch periods do you have? How many lunch periods do you have? That is a telltale sign of an overcrowded school. We have numerous schools that have three lunch periods. Children start eating at 10:30. They do not stop until 2:30.

We have discovered one school that has five lunch periods. I said, if you have five lunch periods, when does the first group eat lunch? At 9:45. Is it not child abuse to make a child eat lunch at 9:45? Is there not something wrong nutritionally, physiologically with making a child eat lunch at 9:45 in the morning?

The principal who told me this has been living with it so long she was not embarrassed. She said, we let them have a snack later on if they get hungry. The last group that eats, we let them have a snack in the morning because they get hungry before we finally get to them. Five lunch periods, from 9:45 up to nearly 2, they are eating in relay teams. It is overcrowded. The capacity has been exceeded.

You should not do that to children. No matter what they do to lie about the statistics and tell us, once we asked the question, how many lunch periods do you have, we have a telltale sign it is overcrowded.

We can go around and see with our own eyes that children have classes in storerooms, sometimes in the hallway, two or three classes are in the auditorium. We can see that the overcrowding is there, even when the bureaucrats do not admit it.

We still have the problem, 91,000 children did not have a seat in New York City when school started last fall, and large numbers still do not have seats and nobody is willing to admit it. So opportunity to learn means that the construction initiative of President Clinton should go forward because at

schools like the schools in New York and the schools in numerous other cities that are overcrowded, that do have unsafe environments, lead poisoning, asbestos, all kinds of problems which affect the health of children. Those schools are transformed into the best schools that America can make.

The President is only proposing a small program that will set off the process, stimulate the State to put in money, stimulate the localities to spend money. And we must understand that. The great emergency for opportunity to learn is the construction of school buildings in our inner cities.

The \$5 billion fund that the President is proposing should be given. The first proportion that they are proposing, up to 50 percent, I understand there were a lot of objections from Members of Congress. Members of Congress, I plead to them to open their eyes and look at the evidence.

The greatest problem is now in the inner-city communities. Children do not have an opportunity to learn because they are denied the basics of a decent place to sit, a safe place to sit, and a place free of toxic substances and a place which is ventilated properly and lighted properly. It is that basic.

Opportunity to learn means much more. But let us at least start with the President's construction initiative. We will follow through. The President is proposing training for teachers, suppliers. The President is proposing a number of items that become very important.

The incentive of having young people in elementary, secondary schools know that they can go to college, if they apply themselves to their studies in elementary and secondary school, that is also important. It is a continuum from early childhood, from the cradle and how you handle a baby when you pick them up and nurture them all the way to lifelong learning of retired people who can still contribute to the society by volunteering, by helping to mentor, by trying to improve our society in a number of ways.

In the process, we should also make certain that we build into our popular culture, build into our popular culture incentives that glamorize academic activities, that glamorize intellectual activities.

I will close by saluting the Clara Barton High School championship team from my district for their performance in the contest to show their knowledge of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I congratulate all the schools and all the youngsters across America who are champions in the area of intellectual and academic activities.

ISSUES FACING THE 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOB SCHAFER of Colorado). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be with you tonight and discuss the many issues that are facing the 105th Congress.

One of the things that we will be voting on very soon is the supplemental appropriations bill. That is a fancy word for a bill designed to send aid to the folks who have been victims of flooding in the Midwest. It also funds the continuation of troops in Bosnia.

There are a lot of us who want to get our troops home from Bosnia. But at this point we still need to fund the ones that are there, and we need to have the debate about getting them home also. But the two purposes of this funding bill are emergency for the flood victims and emergency for Bosnia.

Politics is politics, and we cannot pass a bill around here without something totally unrelated being attached to it. That is always going to be the case, and that is the case with this bill that we are considering. One of the nonemergency items which many people in this House have supported is increased funding for WIC, which is the Women, Infants and Children Program. It is a milk formula program, and the program does a lot of good.

□ 1945

We have identified in our society that if we make sure that a pregnant woman has a proper diet, that the chances of the baby being born without medical complications is much greater; and, similarly, in the first couple of years of the life of the child, if the child is getting proper nutrition and proper diet, then the child experiences far fewer health care problems, which in terms of budget are more expensive. So it is an ounce of prevention.

Now, the Democrats and some of the liberals in the media, the New York Times, the L.A. Times, are actually accusing us of cutting WIC. Now, I am on the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Speaker, and I am thinking, what is going on? No one has even brought WIC up.

Here is what the Democrats are saying. They, in this flood bill, want to increase WIC funding \$78 million. In the spirit of compromise, the Republicans on the committee said, listen, we are not certain that this needs to be increased, but \$38 million is a compromise, it cuts it in half. The Democrats still said we are cutting it.

Now, again, how do we cut what we are increasing? It is the same mentality, Mr. Speaker, that we heard last year from the President and many, many of the liberal members of the Democratic Party in Washington, that when we increased Medicare funding from \$190 to \$270 billion, that was a cut. When we increased student loans from \$26 to \$41 billion, that was a cut. And when we increased the school lunch program 4.5 percent, that was a cut according to liberal mathematics.

It is not the case in elementary school math classes all over the coun-

try, but somehow a lot of people got to Congress without ever taking math courses.

Now, what the Democrats are obviously confused over, and I think very purposely in some cases playing games on, is that three points on WIC. I want to make sure Members realize, A, No. 1, there is a \$100 million carryover from WIC. It is somewhat of an escrow account because we cannot estimate how many children and mothers will be participating in the program.

But right now we are sitting on a \$100 million escrow account. It is sitting there. It has not been depleted. It is unused. That is very, very important when we are talking about we have to do something in an emergency flood bill. That is A.

B, welfare rolls have gone down 15 percent. Now, if we have 15 percent of the national population getting off public assistance, why is it that the President wants to increase a welfare program on an emergency flood bill? It does not make sense. We cannot brag about how well welfare reform is working on the one hand and then on the other hand increase welfare benefits.

No. 3. The Democrat liberals who are pushing to increase WIC funding at this time are using 1994 census data. Now, 1994 was 2½ years ago, and here we have a situation where those are the numbers they are using. But, Mr. Speaker, if we look at 1995 census data, we see that it is being fully funded. Conveniently, the liberals who are pushing for this WIC increase are forgetting the fact that there is new census data available from 1995 which shows full participation.

Mr. Speaker, I really wish in the U.S. Congress, and in the political arena, people would start talking truth and cut out the politics. What is happening here is the same old crowd who were scaring our grandmothers last year, scaring students, and scaring the school kids regarding their lunch programs, they are trying to work them up into a frenzy again, saying that Republicans are picking on little children and mammas, which is hardly the case.

But just to remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, listen to some of the charges made by Members of Congress in the past. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1995: "You are abusive in getting at abuse. You are harsh. You use a meat axe against handicapped children and their parents." I cannot believe that kind of extreme language.

Here is another one: "They want to make sure that our children, who need preventive health care, do not have, and they are looking to close the nursing homes." That was the gentlewoman from Texas, [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 9, 1996.

Here is a quote from the President of the United States, Washington Times, February 25, 1995: "What they", meaning Republicans, "what they want to do is make war on the kids of this country."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous extremist talk designed to incite, maliciously to deceive. Here are some more.

Leon Panetta, White House Budget Director, USA Today, February 23, 1995: "What they are trying to do is literally take meals away from kids. The Republicans are trying to run over our kids."

Here is another quote. There are so many of them, Mr. Speaker, I do not know which ones to pull out. "It is the most callous, cold-hearted and mean-spirited attack on this country's children I have ever seen in my life." Representative COLLINS, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD March 21, 1995.

Here is a good one. The Vice President of the United States. I guess this is—well, I think the Vice President has his own problems at this point, but here is what the Vice President suggested: "Republicans are genetically defective." This is a pretty serious thing. Frankly, it is a little sick and I hesitate to bring it up.

This is a quote. Vice President AL GORE, October 30, 1994: "Ollie North is banking on the fact that he can raise enough money from the extreme right wing, the extra chromosome right wing, to defeat Senator ROBB." Oh man, what dignity coming from the Vice President of the United States.

Here is another one, March 23, 1995. Representative GREEN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "We are talking about stopping children from having a hot lunch."

Here is another one. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAULO], May 9, 1996: "And they are sincere in wanting to do harm to working men and women in this country."

Here is a great one. Mr. MILLER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 3, 1995: "It is a glorious day if you are a fascist. It is a glorious day."

Here is another one, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RUSH, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 3, 1995: "The blood-suckers in this Congress are lead by Count Dracula."

One more. Senator LEAHY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 24, 1995: "This assault on America's children will be stopped."

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of extreme garbage we have to hear on the floor of the House. And it is one thing for the Speaker and myself, as a Member of the Congress, to have to listen to such charges, because, after all, it is somewhat what our job is about, but to go out to school kids, to go out to the elderly, to go out to the moms and dads and say this kind of thing, I cannot imagine. I could not do that, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly there are times when I get furious with the other side. I know the Speaker feels the same way. But I do not remember ever saying that a Member of the other side was going to use a meat cleaver on kids or wanting to put harm on American working men and women. What kind of low level has public debate in America sunk to when

people are allowed to use such extreme rhetoric and get away with it?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of winning a debate, this is a matter of public decency. We are the leaders in this country. We should act at a higher standard than mud wrestlers at the local bar. And yet this is what some of the Members of Congress seem to think is the right tactic.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not cutting WIC. And if my colleagues listen to the cries about cuts in the past, we can see it is the same old game.

Here is what has happened. When we passed welfare reform, and in doing so we scaled back a number of programs, we also increased the funding in other programs such as child care, such as parent support, tracking down dead-beat dads. And now, because these programs have been reformed, many people are getting off welfare.

But many of the poverty brokers in government circles are doing everything they can to try to get around these reforms. They are saying, "Oh, well, now we have a politically target rich environment for going after new programs and trying to raise the government involvement in folks' lives." Right about when they are about to get independent, the government poverty broker bureaucrats are rushing back in there and saying, "Wait a minute, I found some gray area in this law. You do not have to get independent, even if you are a 25-year-old able-bodied male."

I am sick and tired of single women in my district with two kids, working a job, raising children and paying taxes and having to come home after a 60-hour week and supporting some 25-year-old male who is too lazy to work. It is time that we say to folks that they have got to get to work. Some of them just got to get out of the wagon and help pull it. I think it is very, very important.

Mr. Speaker, we went a long way in the last Congress to change a lot of things. Welfare reform was only part of it. But, in addition, we passed the line item veto so that the President of the United States could zap fat out of the budget. We passed security reform litigation. We passed a tough gift ban. We passed lobbyist registration, the first time in 50 years. We passed products liability reform.

We ended farm subsidies and gave farmers the freedom to farm so that they would have more flexibility in deciding which crops to plant and when to plant them.

We passed the Paperwork Reduction Act so that businesses that do commerce with the Federal Government would not have to fight so much red-tape.

We stopped the practice of unfunded mandates, and this is the practice of the Federal Government saying to the local county commissions that they have to provide certain services, that they have to increase the taxes in their county to pay for it because the Fed-

eral Government is not going to help them. In other words, we were micro-managing counties all over the United States right here out of Washington, DC.

We cut congressional staff by one-third. We reduced our own operating budget by \$67 million. And for the first time in history, we passed the Shays Act, which put the U.S. Congress under the same workplace laws as the private sector.

These were all very, very important reforms. And, in addition, the debate now, Mr. Speaker, is not whether we should balance the budget but how to balance the budget. We have been working on balancing the budget and making some progress, but we are doing that without cutting important programs such as Medicare.

I have with me the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who has been a leader in protecting and preserving Medicare, and I would now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is amazing to be here in May and to think that we may be close to an agreement with the White House on a 5-year effort to get our financial house in order and balance the Federal budget. But it is very distressing when we still hear the rhetoric that when spending goes up we are still having a cut.

I just think something I would like at least to do would be to revisit what did not happen last year, because I do not want people to think it is going to happen this year.

What did not happen last year is we did not cut Medicare, we slowed its growth. We did not cut Medicaid, which is health care for the poor and nursing care for the elderly poor.

Mr. KINGSTON. In fact, if the gentleman would yield, as I recall the numbers, we went from \$89 billion to over \$140 billion for health care for the poor, or Medicaid.

Mr. SHAYS. Medicaid. That is correct. And we did not cut the School Lunch Program, we slowed its growth slightly, but allowed for more discretion in how it is spent.

And I want to get back to each of those. We did not cut the Student Loan Program. It went up quite significantly.

I would just go backward from the issues I mentioned. The Student Loan Program, when we passed our plan and sent it, the President was spending \$24 billion. And in the 7th year of the plan, under our plan, it would have spent \$36 billion. Only in Washington when we spend 50 percent more do people call it a cut, but it was called a cut.

Now, it is true that it would have gone to \$40 billion in terms of tax money. There was \$4 billion that we did not spend. But the \$4 billion we did not spend was actually money that we said that the banks would pay instead of the taxpayers. The banks would cover more of the bad debt and the banks would cover more of the administrative costs.

So the irony is when our plan was defeated, the taxpayers now have to pay \$4 billion more and we saved the banks, who would still have made a good income from participating in the Student Loan Program.

□ 2000

That was one example, going from \$24 billion to \$36 billion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not true that run by the Government the student loan program lost \$1 billion, but run by the private sector it did not lose any of the money?

Mr. SHAYS. We have a certain part we call the direct student loan, which is in essence run by the government. The government was saying that this program was cheaper than to have the banks do it. But what they forgot to do was to compute in the cost of the government administering the program. So it did look cheaper until the GAO and the Inspector General said, wait a second, you better take a look at this, because this program is going to cost you more.

Also I need to say that when you had the institutions deciding who would get the loans, particularly with the proprietary schools, they were giving out loans under the direct student loan, actually giving out the government loans to students who would participate but some of them not pay it back because frankly in some of the proprietary school programs they were in, they were not going to have employment when they were done.

This is just to establish the fact that under the student loan program, which some of my constituents thought was being cut, it went from \$24 billion to \$36 billion and we saved the taxpayers \$4 billion, and the banks would have had to pay more. It is funny that sometimes the Republicans are associated with wanting to protect the industry, the banks, and the banks were the ones that were going to have to step up to the plate and make up that difference.

I think I was most outraged when I first heard it of the school lunch program, because the thought that we would, we Republicans, would cut the school lunch program, I thought was probably one of the dumbest things I could imagine. When I heard, saw the President come before the students and have them be set up as the prop for the national media and they seemed quite concerned, probably mostly because there was so much attention and here was the President of the United States, it is a pretty big deal, but to think he would have used the students as a prop to tell people something that frankly was not accurate. What was not accurate is we were not cutting the student lunch program, we were not destroying it as he described, we were not eliminating the program. We were saying instead of it growing 5.2 percent more a year, it would grow at 4.5 percent a year, that we would grow in spending from \$5.1 billion in the seventh year to \$6.9 billion in the seventh year. Only in

Washington again when you go from \$5.1 billion to \$6.9 billion would people call it a cut. But they did.

But what we did do, which was very important, is, I do not know if everyone in the country knows, I did not know as a Member of Congress, I had been here 8 years at the time, that every student in the country, rich or poor, is subsidized 30 cents. My daughter is subsidized 30 cents. I make a decent income, a very good income as a Member of Congress. My wife is a teacher. Yet my daughter was subsidized 30 cents in a suburban school that is quite wealthy. What we were saying under our plan, we were allowing local governments and State governments to design the plan better so that they could reallocate the money from the wealthy kids in the wealthy communities and spend more in the urban areas. So when the President suggested that maybe my students in Bridgeport or Norwalk or Stamford might have less, they actually in my judgment would have had a lot more, the kids that needed it.

The gentleman gave the numbers on Medicaid, health care for the poor. But the one that clearly I felt most enthusiastic about was our plan on Medicare, health care for the elderly.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will pause a minute to go back to why touch Medicare. It is the political equivalent of messing with dynamite with a lit fuse. Politically, you always take the path of least resistance. If you can avoid a controversial issue, you do. Why would we touch this lit dynamite on Medicare?

Mr. SHAYS. We wanted very candidly to preserve the program and to save it from bankruptcy.

Mr. KINGSTON. Who said it was going bankrupt? I want to make sure. Let us go back to April 3, 1995, the Medicare trustees report.

Mr. SHAYS. The board of trustees of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, they are the group that oversees the Medicare Trust Fund. People in this country pay Medicare in two ways, health care for the elderly. One is they put money aside in the trust fund. That is the trust fund I allude to. If they are hired by an employer, they pay 1.45 percent of their income into this trust fund. If they are self-employed, they pay double, 2.9 percent. This money goes in the trust fund to be there when they are older and it pays all Medicare Part A, which is the hospital costs of a senior. Then you have Medicare Part B, which is paid in part by the individual in a premium, but most of it is paid for by the government in direct taxes coming out of the tax income each year.

But the trust fund, we were told, was going bankrupt, and not by an organization separate from the administration; the administration was telling us. President Clinton's appointees, 5 of the 7 people who sit on this board were his appointees, they said it was going to go bankrupt by the year 2002. They said that 2 years ago. Last year they said it

would go bankrupt by the year 2001. After he vetoed the bill they pointed that out. So it was now going to go bankrupt a year earlier. And last week they just reaffirmed that the trust fund will run out of money by the year 2001. So you could say, well, we are playing with dynamite. I do not consider it a game, and the gentleman does not either. What we were doing is to make sure we step up to the plate and save this program.

Mr. KINGSTON. This is what we are paid and elected to do and that is to act in a responsible manner and as the report indicated the other day, I believe, Medicare today is losing \$36 million each and every day.

Mr. SHAYS. It is really incredible to think that right now the trust fund has in the balance \$112 billion. That will go down in 1998, the next year, to \$92 billion. When you figure that loss on a daily basis, each day that passes the trust fund is losing \$35 million. That is in the year we are in now. Next year it is going to lose \$55 million each day. And the next year after that, in 1999, it is going to lose \$78 million each and every day.

This is according to the President's trustees of this fund, the people who have the fiduciary responsibility to protect it as we do. They have shared this information with us. They have told us the problem. It is up to us to come up with a solution. Then they have said in the year 2000, it will lose about \$103 million a day, and it will be bankrupt in 2001, because it will be losing \$134 million each and every day.

We came up with a plan 2 years ago that we will continue to advocate and promote that did not increase the copayments for seniors, did not increase the deductible for seniors, it did not increase the premium for seniors. What it did do was allow seniors for the first time to choose to have a private medical plan. In having the private medical plan, they could get into this plan and the only way they would be interested in doing it is if they got more than they get under the traditional Medicare fee-for-service plan that we have now.

By getting into a managed care plan, the managed care plans would have had to offer them more than they get now, because what they get now is pretty nice. But they still have to pay the MediGap under existing, they still have a premium to pay. But some of the managed care programs were going to give eye care, dental care, a rebate on the copayment of the deductible, and in some cases pay the premium and the MediGap.

If a senior did not like the managed care plan, we allowed them under the bill that the President vetoed to get out of the plan each and every month for the next 24 months. In other words, if they were in it for 3 months and did not like it, they could leave. If they were in it for a month and did not like it, they could leave.

Mr. KINGSTON. The first election to get into it was up to them because

automatically they would be reenrolled in traditional Medicare.

Mr. SHAYS. Right. They were not required to take this. The only way they would have gotten into it, it is not like some of the telephone plans where you all of a sudden found yourself under a new long distance carrier. You stayed under the plan you were. But what would have happened in my judgment is some of their neighbors would have gotten into the managed care plan, they would have pointed out how they were getting eye care, dental care, prescription drug assistance that they were not getting under the traditional Medicare plan and people would have said, well, I want that too, and they would have joined.

The reason why the managed care plans could save money is there is so much waste and fraud and abuse in government oversight of health care that the managed care plans could oversee it better and they would still have made money, they would have saved money, through all the waste that exists. Yet they would have been able to give more than the senior would have now. We also allowed for medical savings accounts. We did not require people to participate. But if someone wanted to put money, the government would have actually given a senior a certain payment, \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year, we would have given the senior that money, they could have put it in the account. If they spent less than \$3,000, they would have actually saved money. If they spent more, they would have had to pay for it on their own. The only requirement is that they would have had to get a \$10,000 catastrophic plan, so that if they really had serious health problems, there would be an insurance program for them.

Mr. KINGSTON. But what would happen is for seniors who were in good health and decided they could take whatever smaller bills that were manageable, they would pay that out of that escrow account, keeping half of whatever they saved.

Mr. SHAYS. And it was tax-free.

Mr. KINGSTON. Tax-free. Yet they would be covered for the million-dollar claim.

Mr. SHAYS. That is why when the gentleman says, the traditional view is that we are playing with dynamite, I was proud to go to my constituents and tell them. This is a plan I had worked on with the gentleman and others for literally years. We now in the majority had a chance to finally begin to implement it.

Mr. KINGSTON. The only thing about Medicare that is dynamite is when it is misconstrued intentionally for political gain. I have never seen people who just maliciously go out there and lie to the American seniors. I think it is an insult to the generation who fought for freedom and liberty in World War II and my dad and your dad and moms. I just think it is totally sick for people to go out and lie to grandparents, but that is what happened, and Medicare, being Medicare,

politics being politics, that is probably going to happen again.

Mr. SHAYS. I think that more and more people began to understand what was happening, but it required a lot of work to make sure people did understand.

One last point we should make on the Medicare plan that I thought was really ingenious and I thought would save a lot of money. We were providing in our legislation language that allowed a senior if they found a mistake in their bill to get a percent of what they found. For instance, I have had some seniors who have talked about bills that they saw. First off the bills sometimes are not sent to the senior. Under our legislation we would have required the seniors to have a copy of their bill. We would have required the bills to be put in simple language that an individual could understand. If you had a chest x-ray, you say that. If you had a visit from the doctor, you make clear the visit from the doctor and how long it was and what it was for. Then a senior could say, "I never had that visit with the doctor, and the \$300 charge is not a valid one." We would have given a senior, we had not written the regulation, that would have been up to the administration, but they could have determined that, say, 10 or 20 percent of the savings would have gone to the senior. Some seniors would have found that they would have made money. But in the process, they would have saved us literally hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is exactly right. I do not think it is always fraud. I think a lot of it is just sloppiness and negligence. There is a story, I am sorry I cannot cite the person but she received a bill for an autopsy, went to a doctor and said, "I never had an autopsy," and they said, "Yes, you did. Here is the bill." She said, "No, I did not have an autopsy. It's me, I'm alive."

They said, "Okay. Well, you had an MRI." She said, "No, I did not have an MRI."

They said, "Well, you had a mastectomy." "No, I've never had a mastectomy, either. I know with certainty that none of the above were received."

Mr. SHAYS. I had a senior who in one meeting, she gave me a stack of envelopes that must have been about 3 inches tall, many, many envelopes. They were all bills that she received. She received them all the same week. She simply said, why could they not have been put in one envelope? Some of them were duplicative. It was a pretty extraordinary thing.

I will say to the gentleman that another person stood up at this meeting and said, "You understand I am a man." I said, "Sure, you look like a man. You look like a senior."

He said, "Well, I was charged for giving birth." He said, "That is not possible but I was charged that."

I notice, and the gentleman is in charge of this floor, but if I could have

the honor of introducing my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will wait one second before he does that. What we need to do is we need to have a contest for the most ridiculous and absurd Medicare story, and let us all go out there and find those crazy stories. I just think it is so ridiculous, that this system is so broken that live people are being billed for autopsies, men are being billed for women-only type procedures. We need to change it and we need to protect and preserve it. I am going give the gentleman the pleasure of introducing his colleague from Connecticut, the leader on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAYS. I might say to the gentleman before I introduce her that one of the reasons we have these abuses is the way that Medicare pays the bill is the bills are submitted and paid for and then after the fact, they are reviewed, basically 1 percent of the billings and 4 percent of the total billing costs. The money has already been paid out. Then they are asking the money to be returned. It is a crazy system.

I am going to introduce the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. We are talking about the fact that our trustees have pointed out that Medicare is losing \$35 million a day and that next year it is going to lose \$55 million and the year after \$78 million and the year after that, each day, \$103 million, the year after that, in the fifth year of our plan, what we want to prevent from happening, in losing \$134 million. Yet under our plan last year which the gentlewoman played the central role in, she made sure that we spent 60 percent more on Medicare under the life of the plan, and on a per-person basis, 50 percent more.

□ 2015

You know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] and I were just marveling at the fact that only in Washington when you spend 50 percent more per beneficiary would someone call it a cut. I just welcome you. You are the leader in the health care field in the Committee on Ways and Means, you are my colleague in Connecticut, and it is just really great to have you join us.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am proud to be with you tonight, and I appreciate your gathering for this special order. It is such an important program, Medicare is. It is critical to our seniors, but it is just as important to their children and grandchildren. It is one of the pillars of retirement security. If we cannot guarantee our seniors some level of financial security and health security, then we are not the great and free Nation that I believe we are.

I just want to say a couple of things, picking up on what you were talking about. First of all, I wish we were here tonight talking about how we had slowed the deficit that is developing in Medicare, that this year we were not

going to see as big a debt in Medicare as we had last year, and we could have done that. We had a good plan if we could have passed it. If we could have had people listen deliberately to discussion about the problems and the solutions, we would be here tonight cheering the turnaround in Medicare and the preservation of Medicare for our seniors and our children.

Mr. SHAYS. The fact was we passed the legislation if it could have been signed into law by the President.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. That is true, and one of the provisions in that legislation goes to the heart of what you were saying. It allowed seniors to report things they had been charged for wrongly and share in the savings. Remember they would have gotten half the cost of that delivery that the gentleman was billed for in savings, and the government would have gotten the other half of the savings. So it would have created, in a sense, an enforcement police the size of the entire senior population in America, and frankly that would have been a great thing.

Mr. KINGSTON. It certainly would have paid for some of the medical expenses out of pocket.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. You bet, you bet. It would have been good for the seniors, good for the program, good for the government because it would have created the right partnership between the government, the seniors of America and the providers of health care in our country who are without doubt the best.

But I also want to point to a couple of other things that were in our bill last year because some of them actually the Congress passed and the public did not have a chance to understand that, one of the provisions in the medicare formula.

Mr. SHAYS. When you say we passed, we passed it the first time. You mean the one that was signed into law by the President.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. That is right. There were a few other provisions that we were able to get into other bills a second time, and the President did sign, and one of those was an aggressive attack on Medicare fraud.

Now I am the chairman of the Ways and Means subcommittee that does oversight, so we oversee all of the programs that are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but one of them is Medicare, and we had our high-risk program hearing; that is, the highest risk of fraud programs under our jurisdiction, and one of them was Medicare. Medicare is one of the programs in our Nation that has an extraordinarily high risk of fraud and a high volume of fraud. The inspector general said \$20 billion of our expenditures in Medicare every year are fraudulent, paying for health care you did not get or did not need.

So it is a very big problem, and I am proud to say that last year we did get

passed a new antifraud program that will put regional people out in every regional office looking at nothing but Medicare fraud.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now if the gentlewoman would yield for 10 seconds, \$26 billion in fraud in Medicare and Medicaid together. That is twice the annual budget of the entire State of Georgia. I am not sure what your budget is in Connecticut, but you can run the State of Georgia tax-free for 2 years just on what the Medicare and Medicaid fraud is.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. That is truly stunning, that is truly stunning, and people ought to try to imagine in their minds what \$26 billion would buy if it were spent right.

You know Medicare is an outmoded benefit package. It does not cover prevention. It only helps you after you get sick. If we had \$26 billion that is spent on fraud to use for preventive benefits, would it not be a wonderful thing for the seniors of America?

Well, I am proud to say that we passed a bill that put \$800 million into fraud inspectors in the regions, and those people are now, most of them are hired. That program will be completely in place in the next few months, and next year when we stand here at least I hope we will have better numbers and we will be able to demonstrate that the Republicans put in place a very strong antifraud effort in Medicare.

But I do regret that the President vetoed the bill that would have let every senior in America be part of making Medicare honest.

Mr. SHAYS. I think that we could point out that there are times that we have big disagreements with the administration, but this dealing with the fraud area, that was one area where we had some cooperation and we wanted to build on the cooperation we had with the White House. In that bill that passed on health care reform which dealt with the whole issue of portability, in that bill that you make reference to, section 2 which dealt with fraud, we also made health care fraud a Federal offense for public and private sector, and the reason why we did that was that we found that those that wanted to cheat the system were sometimes going from one State to another, and if the public sector was being more aggressive, it went into the private sector. So we put it all in one package so they could not escape and we could follow them, and in some instances we are talking about some organizations cheating the system not \$10 million but literally hundreds of millions of dollars.

So we are proud of the fact that that is something we did and grateful that the President agreed that it was something that he could sign.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I am also pleased that the President is working with us this year on another very important part of the Medicare reform bill that will be good for seniors but also good for all Americans of

every age. In the Medicare reform bill we had written a provision that allowed hospitals and doctors to develop their own networks so they could compete with insurance companies. That would give us competition in the managed care market between insurance company plans where there are stockholders involved and you have to have a return on your investment and provider sponsored networks where the physicians and the hospitals actually are the means of delivering care, and therefore, hopefully, the decision about quality of care would be kept very close to the provider, to the doctor and the patient, to the hospital and the patient, to the provider and the senior citizen. And we know this will not only be good for seniors to have these provider-sponsored organizations, but they will be good for people of every age to have managed care systems in which the ownership and the responsibility is right anchored with the people who know the most about health care and the quality.

Mr. SHAYS. It is kind of amazing to think that existing law does not allow hospitals and doctors to compete with the insurance industry in this very, you know, important effort of providing the best health care, and one thing I want to express some gratitude for:

The President did veto our Medicare reform legislation. It was the election year, and it got caught up in that, sadly. But the bill that he submitted in terms of how it is what he wanted to budget on Medicare, a lot of the parts to the legislation were really taken out of our bill that he vetoed. Just in making reference to the very example you are talking now, allowing the private sector to compete with the insurance industry.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. That is right, and our goal was to ensure that seniors would have the choice of health care plans that offered, for instance, prescription drug coverage, that offered better preventive benefits, that better covered the deductibles and copayments in Medicare, and because we wanted seniors to have those choices we wrote provisions in the Medicare reform law that allowed the development of hospital and physician networks, and you know, as one who represents an area of the country that has a lot of small towns and small hospitals, I can tell you that allowing the development of these provider-sponsored networks is key to the survival of these smaller hospitals and the medical community around them.

So I am pleased that this year the administration is back before the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means on which I serve. They are saying that we need to do this, they are going to work with us this year, and I believe we are going to improve the health care system and the choices not just for senior citizens but for all Americans, and that is in everybody's interest.

So I am pleased that this year we will improve the benefits under Medi-

care. We will also slow the growth in costs through the kind of progressive change that is possible through good governments and good choices.

Mr. KINGSTON. We will protect Medicare not just for the next election but for the next generation, and so that not only will your mom and dad and grandparents be able to use it, but you and I will be able to use it, and our children and their children. I think that is very important.

I think this is all part of common-sense government. We need common sense in public policy, we need common sense in spending, and we need common sense in health care policy, and one of the issues that we have thought—we hope we are on the eve of a breakthrough in the budget.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] had mentioned earlier tonight, as a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget, that negotiations have been going on since January on the budget to try to craft a bipartisan agreement so that we can save the fiscal character of our Government for the generations to come, long after the three of us have left Congress.

Let me yield to [Mr. SHAYS] as a member.

Mr. SHAYS. You know, I just would want to say that as we talk, people like the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, budget chairman in the House, and PETE DOMENICI in the Senate are meeting with representatives from the minority in this Congress as well as the White House, and one thing that is quite clear in this Congress is that it is still a Republican controlled Congress, be it only by a margin of 10 votes, and the White House is a Democrat White House, but we all have to be Americans first and Republicans and Democrats second, and I just hope and pray that the talks that have taken place with the White House are yielding fruit. I think they are.

I know what our ultimate objective is. We want to balance the Federal budget and get our country's financial house in order. We want to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, not just for future generations, but for the generations that exist now, and we want to transform this caretaking social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into what some call caring opportunity society. I think that we are not just trying to transform social welfare in which the gentlewoman from Connecticut was so active, but we are looking to end welfare for corporations and we are looking to end welfare in the farming industry.

And the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] was so on target in pointing out that with the freedom to farm bill we are allowing the energies of the farmers to not be encumbered by lots of Government intervention and welfare payments.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. You know I am very proud of this Congress and the way we are working together. I know the press has reported primarily

controversy around campaign practices of the White House and the last election and some other things, but underneath that we are doing the people's business, and the negotiations around the budget that have gone on have been frank, serious talks about how do we through common sense reach the goal of a balanced budget and return fiscal sanity to this Nation.

Just today on the House floor, I guess it was yesterday on the House floor, we passed an adoption and foster care reform bill so that children will not get caught in abusive homes and they will not get lost in our foster care system, and we did that bipartisanship, both parties working together, both parties here on the floor talking about the ways in which this bill would help children in America, some of our concerns about that bill as well, and today had a long debate about housing, public housing policy, and we will bring forward in the next few days a bill by bipartisan vote.

Mr. SHAYS. It is interesting, if the gentlewoman would yield, probably not many people know what we did with foster care and adoption because there was not this rancorous battle between Republicans and Democrats.

□ 2030

So it does not always get the attention of the media, but it was excellent legislation that will do a lot of good.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, that is why I wanted to bring that up, because we do a lot of real thoughtful work here about the problems in our lives and certainly abused children is a very big problem in the communities that we represent, and we took a giant step toward protecting children just yesterday. It will move to the Senate now, and then to a conference committee, and in several months it will move to the President's desk and children and families will do better in America because of a thoughtful, bipartisan and common sense Congress.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, that is why I think it is so important that we look, always look at the big picture. Mr. Speaker, there is an expression I heard. I wish I could attribute it, I cannot; a second time tonight that I cannot attribute a good quote, but it was that idealism is ignorance easy.

So often people come to us and they have one side of an issue and they have the solution and it fits just perfectly on the bumper sticker. But our job as legislators is to sit there and listen to both sides of the issue. We realize we may be elected by 51 percent of the people, but we represent 100 percent of the people. In fact, we are represented from Connecticut, but not just to represent Connecticut. We all have to look out for the United States of America, and in doing so, in that framework, sometimes it is very difficult.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we can balance that budget, interest rates, according to Federal Reserve Chairman Alan

Greenspan, we can reduce interest rates. A 2-percent reduction of interest rates on a \$75,000 home mortgage over a 30-year period of time saves American families \$37,000. On a \$15,000 car loan, it saves American families \$900. On a student loan over a 10-year period of time of \$11,000, it could save as much as \$2,100.

Balancing the budget is real. It is not an academic exercise. Balancing the budget is about people, it is not about numbers. I know that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] has been on the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] being on the Committee on the Budget, we spend hours and hours crunching numbers and talking in strange jargon about CBO and OMB and most of these things that most of us do not understand and do not know that we want to. But we do know the old expression that when your intake exceeds your upkeep, then your input is going to be your downfall.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] to repeat that.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am not sure I got it right anyhow, but the fact is, it gets down to this: If you bring in a dollar, you should never, ever spend more than a dollar. And we have since World War II been spending \$1.59 on every dollar that we bring in.

Now, that has not been the case in the last 3 years, but the fact is, you cannot go on forever defying gravity. The children in America need to live in a world where the budget is balanced and where Congress is not spending more money than we bring in.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the children of the world, and I would love the indulgence of my colleagues just to thank the participants of the summit that was in Philadelphia. I had the opportunity to go to the summit, and I have to tell my colleagues that it was very moving to see Mrs. Reagan there on behalf of her husband, President Reagan, to see Jerry Ford and Jimmy Carter and George Bush and our President, Bill Clinton, all focused in a common effort to direct the public's attention on the need to really respond to our children.

I know that there is some controversy in terms of say AmeriCorps, which some on my side of the aisle might disagree with. I certainly am a strong supporter; others raise questions. But as a former Peace Corps volunteer, I just found it extraordinary that we had Republican and Democrat Presidents all saying that this matters so much to them that they were willing to devote a sizable amount of their time. More importantly, to have Colin Powell basically take this on as really a lifetime effort.

This is in my judgment, I would want to say on the floor of the House for the record, I am absolutely convinced that people will look back and say that something very wonderful happened in

this country about drawing the public's attention to our kids.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told by some who say that politicians are elected by adults to represent the kids, and I really believe that. Here we had four Presidents and a First Lady; we had Colin Powell, a distinguished citizen, who basically said that he is going to devote his life to making sure that Americans realize the need of helping our kids. He is doing it by example, our Presidents are doing it by example, and this is something that he is asking all Americans to focus on and think about.

In my city of Bridgeport that I represent, I would contrast it to the city say right next door, the community of Fairfield. I was in a parade, in a Fourth of July parade, and near the beginning of the parade in Fairfield and you march along and there are just literally tens of thousands of people along the march, and you get to the reviewing stand. And an hour and 20 minutes later I said, "When is this going to end?" And he looked at me and said, "It is going to go on for a while."

And what was it? This was a wonderful parade of Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and Indian Guides and Indian Princes and soccer teams and volleyball teams and bands. I thought, the challenge for some children in our country is deciding what they do not do, they have so many options.

Then I thought, right next door in the city of Bridgeport I know the children do not have that same option. After school there is really nothing for them to do. We are really asking in this summit for Americans to adopt a child, to be a mentor, and to help them. Not Government.

I will just say one thing. One of the absurdities that took place in the summit was a group that marched in opposition to the summit because they said it was wrong for us to think that volunteers should be doing these things, that it was government's responsibility. I wanted them to think of what was the very basis of our strength as a country, the active participation of citizens.

President Clinton I think pointed out something that I found was very stirring. We were at the site of the founding of our country, and I remember as he gave his speech as the other Presidents had given theirs, he said that when Jefferson left after the conclusion of the Constitution, a woman asked Jefferson whether this was going to be a monarchy or a republic. And Mr. Jefferson said to her, "It is a republic if you can keep it."

Then the President talked about a more perfect union. He said even in that Constitution we had slaves. In that Constitution, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] could not vote. I would just point out that we are making this a more perfect Union. I think the task for us now is to really alert the American public for the need to not depend on government. The era of big government is over, but the era of big problems still remains.

I was stirred by this, and I hope other Americans were, that this is going to be a citizen Government helping our kids, giving them activity, giving them a framework, giving them discipline, helping them see mentors that are somebody other than someone selling drugs and leading a bleak future.

So I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues, but it was stirring, and I really believe that if we can use that summit and the bipartisanship that existed there and throw these politics out the window a bit, we will be a more perfect Union.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I certainly am proud of my hometown of New Britain, CT. Last Saturday we had Christmas in April and I and many, many other people from the town turned out.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman might want to explain Christmas in April. People of all walks of life, some brought their children, and we painted and repaired inside and out.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Christmas in April, it is a way the community gives the gift of Christmas to families who need help.

I had the privilege of working at the home of an elderly couple who for decades have helped lead and care for veterans of this Nation's wars. They have done so much for others, and it was so nice to be a part of a team of 19 or 20 that painted rooms inside and painted things outside, that cleaned up the yard, that replaced a ceiling. I mean it was just wonderful. It was a gift to people who have given all of their lives and who now in their elder years need some help with that kind of work.

And in New Britain, Connecticut, volunteers painted, repaired and upgraded the homes of 40 families. Some of them elderly, some of them single parents with young children, some of them just people who for one reason or another needed help with those kinds of chores, and some brought their children, just so their children could see that working together we are a powerful force, we Americans, and Government can never replace that energy, that faith, that love, that hope.

I am proud to be a part of a Government that understands that people are the power and is working to assure that Government partners those powerful people and shares with them their vision of hope, opportunity, and justice for all. That is I think what we are talking about and why we have been so concerned with Medicare, preserving Medicare, strengthening Medicare, protecting Medicare for our seniors, but also fixing it so it better serves not only our seniors but their kids as they retire and our grandchildren when they retire.

It is very nice to be with you gentlemen tonight. I am sorry that I have to excuse myself because I have some calls that I have to make.

Mr. KINGSTON. We thank the gentlewoman for joining us, and we thank the gentlewoman on behalf of all Amer-

icans, particularly seniors, for all that you are doing to help protect and preserve Medicare.

Mr. SHAYS, if the gentleman is going to stay, I wanted to touch base a little bit on some of these tax issues.

Mr. SHAYS. I would love that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask you this: We have been talking about balancing the budget. Is it consistent or inconsistent to talk about cutting taxes and balancing the budget?

Mr. SHAYS. Oh, it is definitely consistent.

Mr. KINGSTON. Consistent with a "C".

Mr. SHAYS. And important, for a variety of reasons. First off, we need to recognize that when you increase some taxes you actually get less revenue because in a dynamic model people respond. They say taxes are higher and they find ways to avoid paying them by doing other things. If you have a luxury tax on boats, they simply decide not to buy boats, as we found in our 1990 budget agreement when we increased the tax on boats and people stopped buying them.

So you have a dynamic model. Sometimes with lower taxes you get more revenue. We would find that to be true specifically with the capital gains exemption.

Imagine a farmer out West whose neighbor wants to sell land and they want to buy the land, but the neighbor does not sell, and why does the neighbor not sell? Because they would realize such a large capital gain, they do not want to pay 28 percent of that gain to the Government. It might be what is their retirement, it might be what pays for their child's college tuition, and so they simply do not sell.

What you have is, you do not have a transaction taking place, whereas if we lowered the capital gains you would find, in fact, that there would be greater transactions and more revenue. So one of the things that we hope happens is that there is, in fact, a capital gains exemption.

We also hope that there would be a reduction in the tax that people pay on inheritance so that they do not have to sell the farm or sell the business.

So we believe that it is consistent, and I would also say to the gentleman that we would pay for our tax cuts. So if you want a smaller Government, as I do and as the gentleman does, you make the Government smaller and you return the money back to the people to spend as they want and create economic activity which also brings in more revenue.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has answered that very eloquently. The bottom line is, we American people can spend our money better than bureaucrats in Washington can. Let American people keep more of their own savings. They will create jobs, more people go to work, less people are on public assistance. When less people are on public assistance, again, more people working and paying in,

revenues do go up. I think Presidents Kennedy and Reagan have both proven that and I think we need to prove that again in this session of Congress.

Mr. SHAYS. And I think we will.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for being with us tonight and for all of his hard work for the folks in Connecticut and all over the country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. PASCRELL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Thursday, May 1, on account of the death of a friend.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GREEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEYGAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEUMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GREEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. CAPPES.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. WELLER.